Google Inc. et al v. Egger et al Doc. 212

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
AND DORR LLP
John A. Rogovin (*pro hac vice*)
Randolph D. Moss (*pro hac vice*)
Samir C. Jain # 181572
Brian M. Boynton # 222193
Benjamin C. Mizer (*pro hac vice*)
1875 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel.: 202-663-6000
Fax: 202-663-6363
Email: john.rogovin@wilmerhale.com

Attorneys for Verizon Northwest Inc., Verizon Maryland Inc., MCI Communications Services, Inc., Cellco Partnership, and Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: ALL CASES	MDL NO. 06-1791 VRW **REPLY IN SUPPORT OF VERIZON'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO EXCEED OTHERWISE APPLICABLE PAGE LIMITS IN ITS MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' MASTER CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT** **[Civ. L.R. 7-11]**

Dockets.Justia.com

In their response to Verizon's motion for leave to file a 95-page brief in support of its motion to dismiss the Master Consolidated Complaint, Plaintiffs ask the Court to limit Verizon to 40 pages, even though counsel for the Verizon Plaintiffs had previously consented to a 75-page brief. *See* Decl. of John A. Rogovin ¶ 3. While Verizon believes that 75 pages are not enough to set forth its constitutional and statutory arguments fully, the 40-page limit Plaintiffs now suggest is clearly insufficient to explain why Plaintiffs' ten claims fail as a matter of law.

Verizon does not object to Plaintiffs' request that they be granted leave to file a brief of equal length.[1/]

Dated: March 22, 2007

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
John A. Rogovin
Randolph D. Moss
Samir C. Jain
Brian M. Boynton
Benjamin C. Mizer

By: /s/ John A. Rogovin
John A. Rogovin

Attorneys for Verizon Northwest Inc., Verizon Maryland Inc., MCI Communications Services, Inc., Cellco Partnership, and Verizon Wireless (VAW) LLC

[1/] Civil Local Rule 7-11 does not directly address the filing of reply briefs in support of an administrative motion. To the extent leave of the Court is required in order to file such a reply brief, Verizon hereby respectfully seeks leave to do so.